

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
WHEELING**

**SHAWN M. THOMAS,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-32  
(BAILEY)**

**KUMA DEBOO, Warden, DANE  
HEADY, and EDDIE ANDERSON,**

Defendants.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. 48]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R&R on October 2, 2012 [Doc. 48]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court dismiss the plaintiff's ***Bivens*** complaint [Doc. 1] with prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140,


150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); ***Snyder v. Ridenour***, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); ***United States v. Schronce***, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on October 5, 2012 [Doc. 49]. No objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the **Report and Recommendation [Doc. 48]** should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, the defendants' Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment **[Doc. 36]** is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, this Court **DISMISSES** the plaintiff's ***Bivens*** Complaint **[Doc. 1] WITH PREJUDICE**. Finally, the Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of the defendants.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* plaintiff.

**DATED:** October 24, 2012.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE